DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 485 80 EA 006 331

TITLE	[National Interstate Project Conference Proceedings to Study ESEA Developments and Future Needs (Arlington, Virginia, May 1-2, 1974.)].
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Collective Negotiation; *Educational Accountability; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Federal State Relationship; *Interstate Programs; National Programs; State Boards of Education; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; State School District Relationship; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

This publication reports the proceedings of the National Interstate Project Conference. The purpose of the meeting was to study significant developments in ESEA, Title V, Section 505 Projects in 1973-74 and plan Interstate Project needs for the future. The major topics of discussion include: the policy, politics, and survival of State education agencies; the role of State education agencies in teacher collective negotiations; and planning in State education agencies. Other subjects covered are: changing federal-State-local educational goals, educational accountability and the cooperative accountability project, State administration of multipurpose grants, and a committee report on chief State school officers' priorities. (Author/DN)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Policy, Politics, and Survival of State Education Agencies	5
Speaking of Priorities	15
State Education Agency Roles in Teacher Collective Negotiations	20
Selection of Competencies	22
Changing Federal-State-Local Educational Goals	28
Shared Accountability - Demand for Disclosure of Outcome Information	41
State Administration of Multi-Purpose Grants	46
Chief State School Officers' Priorities, A Committee Report	58
Planning in State Education Agencies: The Next Step	60
Cooperative Accountability Project	67

APPENDIX

A. Agenda: National Interstate Conference	72
B. National Interstate Conference Attendence List	76

FOREWORD

This is a report of the proceedings of the National Interstate Project Conference held in Arlington, Virginia May 1-2, 1974. Chief State School Officers, Policy Committee Members, Project Directors and U.S. Office of Education personnel were involved. All eight regions of the United States had representation at this conference.

The purpose of the meeting was to study significant developments in ESEA, Title V, Section 505 Projects in 1973-74 and plan Interstate Project needs for the future.

Robb L. Shanks, Ed.D.
Interstate Project Director
National Coordinator

Interstate Project
for State Planning
and Program Consolidation

Participating States	Chief State School Officers	Policy Committee
Illinois	Dr. Michael Bakalis	Dr. Emmett Slingsby
Indiana	Dr. Harold H. Negley	Mr. Ray Slaby
Michigan	Dr. John Porter	Mr. Alex Canja
Minnesota	Mr. Howard Casmey	Mr. Gregory J. Waddick
Ohio	Dr. Martin W. Essex	Dr. Paul Spayde
Wisconsin	Dr. Barbara Thompson	Dr. Archie Buchmiller

Dr. Robb L. Shanks
Project Director

Project Office:

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Sec. 505) and the sponsoring states. The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

POLICY, POLITICS, AND SURVIVAL OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES*

The topic which you have given me is a most formidable one. I am fully aware of the pitfalls involved in predicting the results of political decisionmaking today. Both at the federal and state levels we find considerable uneasiness and indecisiviness in making major policy decisions concerning the future of any activity. Let us, however, delve into the topic and see where we come out.

The State Departments of Education are well into their second century of service to elementary and secondary education. Up until about 1950 there was very little question, concern, or consideration over what these agencies were doing, their rights and responsibilities to do whatever they were doing, and the need for their services. By and large, elementary and secondary education prior to 1950 was an important, but entirely politically manageable operation of local and state governments. Everyone was clearly aware that education was constitutionally a function of state government. At the same time, most were aware that the states had by statutory and regulatory practice delegated most of their operational responsibilities to local governing authorities, universally known as board of education. It was not until the thirties that the foundation concept of providing substantial quantities of state assistance for the support of education really came into its own. Elementary and secondary enrollment in 1950 was slightly more than 25 million. The annual operating cost of elementary and secondary education that year was about 6 billion dollars. Consequently, education was considered an important and worthwhile function but no undue concern was given to its future, its cost, and its governance for the future. During the fifties significant things began to take place. In 1954 the Supreme Court rendered the now-famous Brown decision which thrust upon education the major responsibility of fulfilling

---

* An address given by Harry L. Phillips, Executive Director of the Governor's Study Commission on the Structure and Governance of Education in Maryland, Room 1513, 301 W. Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 (telephone 301-383-4964) to the National Interstate Conference, Arlington, Virginia - May 1, 1974.

the constitutionally mandated goal of equal opportunity for all people, regardless of race, creed, or national origin. The federal government began to enhance educational opportunities through several new grant vehicles. The teaching profession began to be a viable force through the collective bargaining process. The post-World War II baby boom began to be felt in our classrooms. Industrial and technological potential of the nation was being substantially enhanced, giving rise to additional new forces in society. High mobility rates; major socio-economic differentiations between central city communities and their suburban neighbors became visible; white migration to the suburbs, couples with black migration from the South to the North, all brought significant new economic and sociological surges into our society.

Due to these factors and many secondary effects, elementary and secondary education by the beginning of the sixties took on a great deal more political concern than previously.

The sixties began with a national election in which the nation demonstrated important turns toward more liberal ideas and programs. Productivity in the nation through what historians may label as the most important social development period of the nation's history. During these years the South made a dramatic turn from previous racial segregation policies. It became quite clear that the nation would no longer tolerate flagrant practices of segregation in education and elsewhere. New practices of equality found their way into labor, transportation, and a variety of other domestic endeavors. The federal government had finally developed sufficient motivation to advance a civil-rights act. The assassination of President Kennedy suddenly catapaulted a political master, Lyndon Johnson, to the presidency. His political strategies to utilize all his power to enact much of the liberal thinking of the new frontier into law paid great dividends. The latter portion of the sixties saw the federal government playing a most prominent role in bringing about social, economic, and educational change in the nation.

It was during this period that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 presented a great many new alternatives for public elementary and secondary education. Since all of the educational history and practice in the nation dictated that the federal government should not become directly involved in the administration of schools in the nearly 20,000 school districts in the country, a state-level agency was destined to become the gateway through which the federal resources would be spread and made available to the schools of the land. In the view of many political leaders, this was not an ideal way of accomplishing the end of providing additional supplementary assistance to education. It was simply the only politically workable arrangement available to them. There was also a low level of concern in Washington as to whether the federal resources for educational activities should be passed through state educational agencies or through more politically-oriented structures such as the office of the governor. The education establishment won out and the decision was made to utilize state departments of education as the entry way. Simultaneously, there was obvious action on the part of the federal government to strengthen the capacity of this gateway agent. Nearly all of the categorical enactments carried along provision for staffing and administration in the state educational agency. In addition, there was the all-important Title V program which provided assistance solely for the enhancement of state departments of education. Some of the federal assistance required matching on the part of the state; therefore, additional state appropriations were necessary prior to benefiting from the federal icing for the educational cake. Some different kinds of fiscal concerns and considerations began to be prominent on the scene of the state and local levels of government during this era. In-migration in the central cities, and an additional interest on the part of their populations to provide welfare programs, began to take a major toll from state and local treasuries. The cost of public services had increased tremendously. Public elementary and secondary education by 1970 cost about 38 billions of dollars annually. Enrollments were at about 42 million. In the 1950-70 period the nation had experienced an increase

in expenditures over the same twenty-year period was more than 500%.

State Education Agencies in 1970

Many of the free-wheeling liberal developments which had so rapidly overtaken society in general, and education in particular, in the 1960's were not bristling greatly by 1970. The 1968 election going to the Republican party which traditionally was not noted for its liberalism, plus the enthusiasm of the new administration to relegate to "benign neglect" programs to overcome poverty, programs to overcome deficiencies in housing, programs to advance civil rights, and programs to enhance education. State governments, even though they were recovering much of their fiscal capacity, were finding it impossible to fill the void created by the federal movement from previous levels of support for many of these activities. Consequently, a number of state governments were contemplating possibilities of not filling the lapsing federal commitment and making some conservative kinds of reductions of their own.

This turn of events found state educational agencies with expenditure levels and personnel ranks far beyond the fiscal potential and political will of state legislators and governors to provide necessary continuation support. It was widely known that federal funds were utilized to support as much as 70% of the total expenditures in a sizeable number of state departments of education. In the meantime, the state had picked up very few additional leadership and service functions which were viewed by political leaders as being highly desirable for education. In the meantime, the fiscal plight of local governments had become more difficult. New political pleas were coming forward from local politicians for state absorption of a much larger quantity of the resources necessary to operate elementary and secondary education. Also, in addition, a new 2-year institution, the community or junior college, had rapidly come onto the scene as a very viable and forthright kind of new educational opportunity in the postsecondary world. These two-year colleges were taking their tolls from the fiscal potential of local governments. The collective bargaining process had its impact on educational costs.

Due to the fact that the Congress did not agree with the President and refused to follow a substantial quantity of the emasculating policy for "new society programs", the disrupting action in federally supported education programs was minimal. The severe cutback that would have otherwise been required in state departments of education has thus far been avoided. One other significant development which occurred that may substantially impact educational governance at the state level was the enactment of a general revenue-sharing program by the federal government. The nation seemed to be choking with the administrative minutae associated with a myriad of categorical grant-in-aid arrangements created by the federal government, not only in education, but in a host of other social programs. As a result of a strong-willed effort by President Nixon, coupled with the support of local general government officials, and to a certain extent state government officials, the Congress was finally persuaded to enact a five-year program of general revenue sharing. As most of you know, education was excluded from benefiting directly from the relief these general funds would bring at the local level of government. Education could be included, only at the state level if state authorities such a governors, planning and budget staffs, and state legislatures perceived education to be in a high priority need category. From the educational perspective, this condition may prove to be a most regrettable one as time goes on.

Finally, the equal educational quality phenonemon again presented itself in a major way in the judiciary of the nation, this time not as a thrust at changing attendance policies, but in a frontal assault on the constitutionality of the state school-finance laws. When this adjudication finally arrived at the Supreme Court, the Court failed to substantiate the findings of lower courts and implied that financing education was a state matter and not one that infringed upon equal protection benefits of the federal constitution. Consequently, another major revolutionary change in educational policymaking was averted by that action. Meanwhile, some state-level courts began to pick up the missionary spirit and carried forward on adjudication

dealing with similar violations of state constitutions. A very recent development in this area has just occurred. A Los Angeles Superior Court has just announced a verdict following a trial on the merits of the almost two-year-old Serrano v. Priest case. The judge held that the California state foundation program was unconstitutional even given the recent improvements in that law.

The Current Dilemma

In view of the backdrop of the myriad of forces, some of which were political, other financial, and still others judicial, we now find the plight of state educational agencies and many other administrative and supervisory functions in education undergoing critical analysis on the part of political decisionmakers. My view of this effort is that much of it is directed at leveling off, and perhaps even reducing the burden of administrative costs. It was virtually inevitable that such a time would finally arrive. The pluralistic conditions prevelant in this society make it almost impossible to define and operate an educational program to satisfy a majority. All sorts of pressures have arisen for a greater degree of accountability, school-age population is beginning to level off, the 17 to 24 age group have begun to question the validity of formalized education leading to the baccalaureate level. An unruly and very different value system structure has permeated much of today's youth. Therefore, a very pervasive uneasiness has set in within the political structures of government at the local and state level. This uneasiness concerns the cost of education and the overall contribution which it is making to poorly defined pluralistic goal structures. The "one-man, one vote" restructuring of state legislatures has made their response to educational issues somewhat unpredictable. It is difficult, if not impossible, to convince political decisionmakers that to impose upon education a rigorous cost/benefit mechanism it is simultaneously debilitating to it.

In a period such as this, it places administrative, supervisory leadership, consultative and other functions of any formal governmental structure in severe jeopardy. As the fiscal requirements increase and the school-age population decreases,

the most visible and operable segment of the mechanism receives the greatest public attention. Obviously, in education this is the classroom, and the teaching/learning process. Consequently, this becomes the focus of major consideration in fund allocation and appropriations procedures.

Does all of this add up to a dim future for state educational agencies? Not necessarily. Most probably it does predict a future of minimal expansion and one which must embrace new strategies and designs. It may even predict a severe diminution of effort in the more conservative states, and particularly where state educational agencies are unable or unwilling to make critical changes in their philosophies, procedures, and methodologies of providing state leadership to education.

What Lies Ahead?

As the first part of this paper indicated, the 1970's have brought a new set of forces to bear upon state educational agencies. In my judgment, these forces may take their toll from the affluence of SEA's unless some very necessary actions occur. State educational agencies should accelerate progress toward certain goals in order that the political system of the state may understand and appreciate the role and function of state educational agencies and their potential impact on the future.

Among the more important efforts which state educational agencies must assume critical leadership in are the following:

1. Mount an impressive and continuing effort to communicate to all publics a clearly enunciated set of purposes of education, goals for education, and progress reports of movements being made toward those ends;

2. Establish a planning and analytical capability which is continously prepared to present 5, 10, or 20-year projections and future alternatives for education with clear displays of costs, human resources needed, and other commitments necessary to move the state along any of these routes;

3. Spend substantial effort on organizing and lubricating the orbits of decision-making paths through the rapidly growing complexity of state governments. Important

considerations must be given to such new forces in state government as offices of general planning, offices of budget preparation, fiscal control, legislative research, and liaison officials in the office of the governor, in order that all of these bureaucracies and control mechanisms are clearly conversant with the people's view about education and the cost essential to translate educational objectives and goals into programs.

4. Invent new mechanism which either move procedures and processes of litigation to the courts or to a newly designed quasi-legal, semi-independent authority for state-level disposition of disputes resulting from labor/management difficulties, due-process difficulties, aggrieved-applicant difficulties, rights and privileges difficulties, interpretations of regulation and authority difficulties. Unless such action is taken, it is apparent that legal and quasi-legal functions will consume the majority of the attention of educational leaders and policy-makers.

5. A statewide systematic educational reform and change strategy must someway be found and implemented. The time has passed when we can afford the luxury of isolated and unconnected experimentation. More time and energy must be expended on systematic planning of reform and adoption tactics.

6. The services aspects of state educational agencies, particularly provided in the instructional areas, must be programmed in a more effective and influential way. Perhaps this takes the shape of regional planning or change-oriented institutions encompassing the services of several governmental agencies. In other instances, it may be more useful to phase down this level of effort and arrange to substitute a shared-time plan with college and university staff or a shared-time arrangement for services of local agency support personnel.

7. New practices and procedures for clearly identifying educational issues and obtaining a consensus of judgments on these issues on a statewide basis must be found.

8. Organize and arrange for a better response to the needs of metropolitan and urban areas through such actions as:

a. Analyzing and justifying the financial need of central cities;

b. Plan for new delivery systems for services in urban areas; and

c. Demand meaningful decentralization of the bureaucracies there.

Considerable variations exist on these matters in the array of political cultures on all these matters. Considerable variations exist in state capacities in these areas, and a wide variety of needs at the local level for such services exist across the state. Consequently, it is a bit difficult to envision uniform kinds of movements in all states simultaneously on these objectives.

Summary

I hope it is clear that my view of the objective which you have given me does not predict doom for state departments of education. I hope the first part of these comments has made it very clear that the medieval moat which at one time existed between political decisionmaking and educational decisionmaking has not been bridged at many places with multi-laned spans carrying heavy traffic in both directions. I hope it is also clear that a variety of new forces are now being exerted upon the educational world. Some of these originate in the political domain; others come from inevitable drives of society; others find their origin in rapidly expanded systems of communication and transportation; still others come from strong-willed courses of action being pursued by people exercising new freedoms and opportunities. They all add up to making education an entirely different, and probably the most challenging, enterprise of the public sector. State departments of education have become of age as all of these changes have taken place.

The future, while having some uncertainties, does not appear to be entirely unpredictable; therefore, I do believe the period of rapid growth and development for state educational agencies is past. The cultures and political environments of each of the states will dictate some slightly different directions. I suspect we are engaged in a holding pattern of some duration. Unfortunately, some states will likely take abrupt political action bringing about some diminutions or reductions in efficacies of

states it is very essential for state educational agencies to take some very definite new orientations on matters of high public interest in education.

SPEAKING OF PRIORITIES

This National Interstate Conference is a forum for us to express concern about mutual programs nationally as we are able to do in our respective Regional 505 Conferences. I know much more about what's happening in our Southeastern sister states because of our 505 project. It is the only means we have to meet and exchange ideas and information about regional commonalities and discuss possible answers to questions characteristic of our eight Southeastern states.

I strongly support the continuance of the funding of the ESEA Title V, Section 505 programs. I see these Interstate 505 Projects as the means by which we as chiefs can learn from each other's successes and failures. We can see if our individual priorities are unique or shared. So, I'm particularly pleased to report to you on the results of this national survey recently conducted to determine the Chief State School Officers' priorities for the Interstate Projects funded under ESEA Title V, Section 505. The survey, sent to every Chief State School Officer of the United States and its Territories, reflects the broad spectrum of problems. On first view, the list of 210 priorities from the responding thirty-nine states and three territories looked unwieldy.

But they began to fall into what we consider two natural categories. I must qualify that because we may well have misinterpreted some of the entries. With no agreed-to definitions of terms, I admit that we were handicapped in a few instances such as the category called Information and Dissemination Systems. Because of the wide variety of meanings and definitions, we included in this category the following types of priorities: Management Information Systems, Information Systems, the sharing of information, Dissemination Systems and Dissemination of Information, Common Data Banks, Regional Interstate Projects; Information Sharing, and Media and Communications Technology.

Similarly, the topic of Evaluation presented problems. In some cases it was specifically stated as Self-Evaluation; in some cases the meaning was not clear. Hence, when the interpretation was vague, the priority was counted in two categories; Self-Evaluation and Outside-Evaluation. And where would you place the listed priority, "Eliminating sexist practices in education?" We placed it in Reform and Development of Educational Programs.

Under the listing of categories, the names of the states are arranged alphabetically. Should you feel that your state is not listed properly, please feel free to advise my staff and we shall make the changes and alter the report accordingly. I do want you to know that Louisiana readily admits any mistake. As you know, we're ranked 41st among the states in the number of median school years completed, and continue to have more functional illiterates than any other state, so you might blame it on our poor reading ability and not on misinterpretations. Sincerely, the staff worked hard to present you an honest report of your data, and I feel that the results reflect serious educational problems which we are committed to solve.

In the attached report, you can see the category to which your priorities are assigned. There are two major categories:

1) IMPROVING THE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION

and

2) EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT

The category, Improving the Governance and Management of Education, includes the improvement of governance at the Local and at the State levels. Improved management begins with assessing the needs from accurate information and then disseminating that information. With the pertinent information needed for policy-making decisions, the focus centers on the category of Planning and Evaluation:

Accountability. The survey shows that Planning and Evaluation and Information and Dissemination Systems are running neck-to-neck in importance according to the Chiefs. We used the prerogative of placing the acquisition and sharing of information first because research shows that many of our problems, locally, regionally and nationally, are the results of management by crises and not management based on decisions made after the information has been studied.

The heavy emphasis within the category of Improved Governance and Management of Education reflects not only the growing interest in this area of the educational enterprise, but also the urgent need for better management of education in order to provide the best possible educational opportunities to students. The New York study, School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement, states: "The findings of this study suggest that the differences in pupils' reading achievement in these two schools were primarily attributable to administrative policies, behavior, procedures and practices". We are realizing, and now have an authenticated study, which verifies the fact that effective management is closely related to educational achievement. So we as administrators should stop blaming everything on the teachers and shoulder much of the responsibility ourselves. The results of this 505 survey support this premise with its overwhelming majority of 125 categories which relate to the Governance and Management of Education as compared to forty-seven for the category of Educational Reform and Development.

Obviously, State Education Agencies are not fully utilizing their existing powers as managers. If this survey is to be of value to improve governance and management of education, every CSSO and his staff are responsible. We have expressed our need for improvement in management, and we are ready to assume our responsibility for what's not getting done in the classroom.

The second major category, Educational Reform and Development, has two components:

1) TEACHER EDUCATION

and

2) PROGRAMS

The priorities listed in teacher education range from pre-service to in-service, from changing the existing certification requirements to the establishment of training institutes outside the present college preparatory program. We find that education instruction provides general philosophical idealogies, but rarely relates these to common classroom problems and subsequent solutions. The basic differences between competency-based and conventional educational systems are evident in the amount of choice allowed students with respect to goals, instructional and evaluation procedures, the amount of information given students concerning the instructional goals, and the sensitivity of the system to individual differences. These facts are substantiated by the Report of the CCSSO Task Force on the Improvement of Educational Systems to the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, United States Office of Education. We, like most of you, are in the process of change. Louisiana now has six planning models, state-funded for one year, for competency-based teacher training at six different state universities. We're studying and planning. We're not sure what we want yet, but are agreed it's not what we have now.

And so it is with educational programs. Change for change sake is not good; neither is stagnation. However, enthusiasm must be accompanied by caution. We all know that today's school programs can no longer be contained within four walls. The walls are coming down and that's good. It's not a matter of escaping from education; rather an embracing of life into education. The priorities submitted reflect the problem: Educational programs need leadership. As CSSO's, let's provide that leadership to our teachers and those responsible for program innovations.

Certainly, this survey of priorities proves again that we who are working to improve education acknowledge the weaknesses and because we are here today, we are evidently serious about improving education from its governance - its management - its teachers - to its programs. I guess we're really saying as Paul said to the Corinthians: "We are all members of the same body".

And so we are together: from the parent - to the curriculum writer - to the classroom teacher - to the local administrator - to the school board member - to the leadership staff of the State Agency - and to all who govern. Together, we determine the quality of education for the child. Talk about priorities! The child and what's best for him is our Number One Priority. All of our lists are made for him. There is no other priority.

Report of the National Survey of Chief State School Officers' Priorities for the ESEA Title V, Section 505 Program

Presented by Louis J. Michot, State Superintendent of Education, Louisiana

At the National Interstate Conference, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1974

STATE EDUCATION AGENCY ROLES IN TEACHER COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

Jon Peterson

This study is based on a survey of State Education Agencies (SEAs) in an attempt to gather quantitative and qualitative information about the roles SEAs assume in teacher collective negotiations at the state level and at the district level. The subject of teacher collective negotiations, or collective bargaining, is of current interest, combining at once such disparate sensitive issues as: the organization of public sector employees; questions of residual management responsibilities and rights; the total amount of publically derived revenues allocated to teachers' salaries; and the right of any employee group to achieve some sort of comparable power relationship with management. From such interests, and from the desire to find out what roles other SEAs are assuming, a cooperative group requested the Illinois Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to conduct a survey that would give information on the roles, if any, played by SEAs in the area of teacher collective negotiations.

Preliminary investigations indicated two problem areas. The first was the large variation among states in the laws covering teacher collective negotiations. This implied that roles assumed by SEAs might differ according to the legal status of teacher collective negotiations. The other problem area was the existence in some states of other state-level agencies specifically designated to administer laws relating to teacher collective negotiations. The activities of these agencies, public employment relations boards (PERBs) or similar commissions, might also affect the roles SEAs perform.

In order to deal with these preliminary questions, as well as the major SEA roles questions, a survey instrument was designed, field tested and revised, and sent to 51 SEAs (including District of Columbia), and to the other state-level agencies that were known,or whose identity was indicated by SEA responses. The survey attempted to obtain information about:

1. state legal provisions regarding teacher collective negotiations; and

2. state agency (SEA and other) roles in teacher collective negotiations.

Part of the survey consisted of an abstract of state legal provisions taken from Summary of State Policy Regulations for Public Sector Labor Relations, U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Public Employee Labor Relations, February 1973. Respondents were asked to verify the abstract data or to indicate recent changes in specific provisions. The other part of the survey was a questionnaire listing 29 specific role activities and asking for a "Yes" or "No" response. The specific activities were grouped into seven role categories: administrative, direct involvement, informational, regulatory, policy development, advisement, and communication.

A total of 52 agencies from 26 states and the District of Columbia responded either directly or to a telephone follow-up. Results of the survey indicated substantial variations among state's legal provisions for teacher collective negotiations. Using bargaining rights of teachers as the major variable, it is possible to group states into one of five clusters ranging from "no legal provision" for bargaining rights, through "meet and confer" and "permissive" rights to groups of states with full bargaining rights mandated by statute and with provision for a state administrative agency.

Responses to the SEA role questions indicated the role most frequently assumed was "informational", with considerable role assumptions in "direct involvement", "policy development", and "advisement" activities. Only a few SEAs performed "administrative", and "regulatory" roles. SEAs assumed some roles in states which had no legal provisions for teacher collective negotiations; a greater variety of roles as legal provisions became more complex, and were quite active even in states that established other agencies specifically to administer teacher collective negotiations laws.

The conclusion of this study is that SEAs are "significant actors" in the teacher collective negotiations arena; in general policy development and administration and in specific local situations; in the absence of permissive legal provisions and even in the presence of other, specifically charged agencies.

REPORT OF VIEWS OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS
CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Information from The National Survey of SEA Roles In Teacher Collective Negotiations was presented. This study indicated that SEAs perform several types of activities, ranging from administrative and direct involvement, to communication, advisement, and policy development. SEAs perform these roles when states have no laws covering teacher bargaining rights, and are quite active even when another state agency, a Public Employment Relations Committee/Board, is created to administer state programs of teacher labor relations.

Problems of teacher labor relations in specific states were discussed. These problems in turn raised the question of appropriate SEA roles/activities. While most SEA representatives preferred a third-party role, one in which the SEA was aligned with neither teachers or boards, it was indicated by one SEA that such a third-party role was not possible when the parties were very polarized.

Selection of Competencies

Theodore E. Andrews -
Director of Multi-State Consortium
on Performance Based Teacher Education

Simply, competency based teacher education requires a state to establish specific competencies to be used to grant certificates within that state. Depending upon the method by which the state moves, this can be a very minor adjustment to the present system, or it can be a major overhaul, involving massive shifts of power within that state.

The Multi-State Consortium, consisting of the following states, New York, New Jersey, California, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Texas, Minnesota, Florida, Oregon and Arizona, has been engaged for the past two years in developing a management plan for each state's particular thrust in performance-competency education, as well as publishing a newsletter and various monographs to further the dissemination of information about competency education. The states are not only geographically disparate, but also their attitudes toward performance education range widely across the spectrum, from total commitment to an interesting idea that should be studied.

The Consortium, originally funded solely by Title V, has received additional grants from Teacher Corps and the National Center For the Improvement of Educational Systems which have allowed it to increase the number of states in the Consortium and widen the range of its publications.

One way to look at the state approaches to competency education is to look at how the competency statements are established. Basically, the states appear to be moving three ways:

A. The state in some manner establishes the competencies that teachers must demonstrate.

B. Colleges establish the competencies that their graduates will demonstrate.

C. Consortium arrangements, usually with representatives of colleges, school districts, and professional organizations, are established and this new policy group establishes the competencies.

Briefly, I would like to indicate the varying policy thrusts that fall out of these various approaches.

A. The State Establishes the Competencies

PROS:

1. One standard exists for the entire state.
2. State minimums exist.
3. Teachers can move within the state and be assured that their minimum training is consistent.
4. States have the ultimate responsibility for certifying teachers and should maintain as much control as possible.

CONS:

1. Specific competencies needed by teachers in various parts of the state vary considerably. Statewide minimums are not appropriate to the diverse population in the schools or the needs of local school districts.
2. It is all but impossible for a state to monitor a system and individually evaluate every teacher to see that he or she meets the minimum competencies.
3. The process by which states select competencies is usually so cumbersome and time consuming that the competency statements might well remain policy long after the needs of the schools have changed.

TIME:

Such a system can be made operational as quickly as a state can select the competencies. This could be done in as little as a year's time, although present practice indicates it might take two to five years.

RESOURCES:

To plan very inexpensive, to implement could be very expensive.

CHANGE:

Whether this would be a significant change in the present system or not depends upon the competencies chosen. In most cases, there would be some change; the likelihood is that it would not be a major shift.

B. Colleges Selected Competencies

PROS:

1. The colleges are now in the process of preparing teachers and know the most about what competencies teachers need.
2. Colleges can select competencies unique to their location and the training capabilities of their institutions, thereby providing a range of opportunities for the selection of competencies.
3. Colleges which already possess a training arm for teacher education, can very easily adapt their program to competency demonstration without a major shift.

CONS:

1. Colleges would decide whether a student demonstrates a competency, without any external check on whether the colleges would do this effectively or efficiently.

2. Colleges might select competencies that they believe are appropriate which actually are not appropriate.
3. Without specific state guidelines, one college might require three competencies and another 520.
4. Colleges might simply take pre-existing courses and rewrite them in competency statements, and there would be no, actual change in the program.

TIME:

If the college selection of competencies requires any shift in the curriculum it probably will take a minimum of one year and possibly two years.

RESOURCES:

Could vary from no additional to a significant amount, if committee time is used to select competencies and the curriculum actually changes, the cost could be high.

CHANGE:

Could promote diverse programs yet to be tested.

C. Consortium Selected Competencies

PROS:

1. The checks and balances that would develop between the various agencies would keep all agencies honest.
2. The needs of the schools and the capabilities of training agencies would be brought together in the selection of the most appropriate and needed competencies.
3. Through the representation of different parties, a greater commitment to the programs would occur and the ultimate success of the program would be more enhanced.

CONS:

1. The program that is developed might become more rigid and traditional than either of the other programs.
2. The time involved in getting three groups, with different priorities, to work together might be almost never ending.
3. The three groups might find that they can't work together; here, no program could evolve.

TIME:

It is much more likely that this arrangement would take at least two to five years to even come up with the establishment of competencies. This is a much more time consuming approach.

RESOURCES:

The cost of time alone, in this instance, might be overwhelming.

CHANGE:

This approach has the potential for causing greatest change since, it links together the colleges preparing teachers, and the schools and the teachers. However, it also carries within it potential for causing the least change, since it is possible that the program would become nothing more than current curriculum in the elementary and secondary schools, and every decision might be compromised to the lowest acceptable level within the three groups.

The potential for the greatest change probably lies in one group selecting the competencies whether it be the college or the teachers or the state. It might also be helpful to look at a scale developed recently by Gene Hall to see where states are. He noted six steps that might be found in innovation in an article:

"Implementation of CBTE - Viewed As a Developmental Process"

If innovation is successful, institutions are hypothesized to move through six phases of disequilibrium.

1. Injection, the idea of the innovation is introduced to members of the institution.
2. Examination, the innovation receives study, talk, visits, thought, planning, reading about and committee formation.
3. Preparation, the time following commitment to try out the innovation, when materials and resources are organized and pre-use training occurs;
4. Sampling, first try-out of the innovation on an experimental basis by part or the total user system.
5. Spread, of trail use of the innovation to all potential users with the user system.
6. Institutionalization, the innovation is used as a regular way by all or nearly all potential users.

None of the Consortium states are (and I doubt if any state is) at level (6).

They are at steps 3, 4, and 5; Preparation, Sampling, and Spread. No state has totally institutionalized performance based education. It is probably also fair to say that of the 50 states some 5 to 10 are at level 1, Injection; some 10 to 20 are at the Examination stage; approximately 10 are at the Preparation stage; and 20 more would be in the Sampling and Spread area.

The ultimate question is to what extent performance-based education will be institutionalized. My best futuristic guess is that it will be institutionalized in a number of states and in a number of institutions over the next five years, but the nature of the institutionalization is likely to look more like past programs than like new or different programs; however, only time will tell.

CHANGING FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL EDUCATIONAL ROLES

National Interstate Conference
Washington, D. C.
May 1-2, 1974

by
Archie A. Buchmiller
Assistant State Superintendent
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

It is my privilege to be able to share my perceptions of potential changes in future roles of the federal-state-local school district relationships. As a result of my experiences since I first joined the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction as an Assistant State Superintendent twelve years ago, I seem to be able to easily identify with a former president of an eastern university who said, "I don't mind living in a goldfish bowl - it's just that everyone keeps trying to poison the water."

In the past, the role of both state and federal educational agencies was primarily linked to accounting for expenditures, aggregating statistical information, funding, and providing modest technical assistance to local school districts. At best, only modest investments of financial resources and influence were provided to them. This status was in keeping with concepts of home rule and local autonomy provided by state legislatures to carry out their responsibility for conducting public educational affairs. Throughout our history, occasional increments of control and regulation were provided to accompany funds and legislative policies to accommodate special needs. All in all, the status quo was a tolerable state of affairs, at least for local school districts. I might note parenthetically that any casual examination of the literature in respect to state educational agencies must conclude that it (the literature) has been more kind in its treatment of state departments of education than has

the action of local policies and politics which operate under the axiom that as far as state-level government is concerned, the least governed is the best governed.

As is invariably the case, the pressures for change challenged the decades of educational status quo. Within the last two decades, the federal government has reasserted a stronger interest in educational affairs. This interest, plus the rising expectations of the 1950s and 1960s, raised the hopes of educators at the local, state, and federal levels of government. Clearly, the mood of the citizens had changed to provide more, not less, educational opportunities for their children.

The gathering momentum for change was indicated by Johns as "organizing education as a series of social systems in action to provide the structure necessary to maximize the opportunity for desirable change."(1) Campbell also referred to recent history as a period best described as nationalizing influences on education.(2) Toffler's recent writing characterizes the current period as one which emphasizes that "knowledge is change -- and accelerating knowledge acquisition...means accelerating change."(3) Therefore, by public consensus if not by our consent, dynamic changes seem destined to be part of our educational future.

The popularity of the current quest for educational accountability as evidenced by legislation in 27 states will probably cause federal, state, and local educational agencies to respond to public and legislative demands for information, evaluation of the effectiveness of schools, and the degree to which educational goals are being achieved.

The continuing pressures for greater accountability at all three levels of government will, I believe, lead to and result in greatly changed roles for national, state and local levels of educational governance. Coupled with demands for eductional alternatives, state fiscal reform, citizen participation, increased educational productivity, and scientific management, we may find ourselves led, pushed, squeezed, and legislated out of some of our present roles and tasks into new ones, perhaps not of our own choice. This conviction on my part comes from comments made by congressional and legislative leaders. Let me cite a few samples for you:

- In 1967, the Commissioner of Education indicated to members of the Congress that big city superintendents indicated to him that ESEA funds should be provided to LEAs in such a way that SEAs "can't get their grimy little hands on it."
- One Congressman from Ohio, on May 24, 1967, said "I know why we have federal aid to education. We have it because states have not done the job."
- Another speaking during the debate to turn Title III, ESEA authority over to the states, said, "they (local school districts) urged us on repeated occasions not to place state educational agencies that were hostile and insensitive between them and the federal government."
- A midwest Congressman cited a letter from a consultant who said, "State departments are too sensitive to local, political issues and old-school tie patronage."
- The technical report of the Committee on Education and Labor accompanying the 1974 introduction of H.R. 69 expressed the committee's dissatisfaction with the federal, state, and local efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of congressional programs. It also expressed dissatisfaction with the

amount of information available on the results of such evaluations and the lack of uniformity of a set of national statistics which could be used to compare performance between districts and the states. The committee said, "The committee believes that this lack of uniformity of the evaluative practices has been a major failing of the U.S. Office of Education. Federal administrators, many years ago, should have exercised decisive leadership in encouraging states to develop and require uniformity of evaluation among local school districts; and O.E. should have also encouraged the states to use uniform measures of evaluation among themselves."

- H.R. 69 and S. 1539 requires a USOE bypass of state educational agencies where adequate participation cannot be provided to the non-public sector. Contracts between USOE and state educational agencies seem to have gained favor over state plans in some cases.
- The House committee clearly signaled that aids to state departments of education are expressly intended to provide assistance to local school districts that are without resources to draft and submit applications for innovative programs and other grants from the state department. The committee expects state departments to compensate for the lack of ability of poor school districts to employ personnel who are able to develop complex grant development and evaluation processes.
- Senate Bill 1539 provides for prescriptive administration for bilingual education, right-to-read programs, career education, community education, special projects, etc. Many of these shifts treat SEAs like LEAs in that they are eligible to compete for program funds and contract for an acceptable performance with USOE.

I cite these examples to illustrate past and present congressional attitudes in respect to state and federal operations. Other examples could be

cited which express reservations about the ability of local school districts to change, innovate, involve citizens in decision-making, develop curriculum materials, or meet the needs of minority students. This suggests that greater initiatives and control by the federal government are yet to come in the future, especially in areas of high national priority and concern.

The signals all seem to point to the fact that the local-state-federal partnership is vulnerable for change. Just what changes are uncertain. However, what is certain is that competition, conflict, and controversy will shape and form many of the changes yet to come. Both H.R. 69 and S. 1539 provide clear signals that change in traditional roles may be legislated rather than come about thru a planned or evolutionary process. The institionalization of new roles will not necessarily be comfortable for those who are comfortable with the status quo and past roles. More frequently, the public reaction may follow the circumstances in Michigan in 1972 when a newspaper editorial about the first state educational assessment had this to say: "The damage has already been done this time, but we hope someone does a little more checking the next time before the state department of education is allowed to pull another stunt like the one foisted on thousands of public school pupils this week."(4) Apparently, there was not a full awareness that a branch of state government had decreed that something be done at the local level.

Another example may be found in statements made in Education Daily by Thomas Glennan, Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in the Office of Economic Opportunity.(5) He warned that the avoidance of accountability is the single most serious threat to a more pluralistic educational system. He cautioned that unless the local community can obtain dependable measures on how well its school system is doing for its children, the demand for national standards will become greater and eventually prevail.

Sometimes spending habits by state educational agencies are inconsistent with what they claim to be their priorities. A survey of SEA funding, conducted in June 1973 by the Upper Midwest Regional Interstate Project under the direction of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, analyzed the effect of the utilization of 503 funds by Seas in the order of priorities mentioned in ESEA, Title V:

1. Statewide educational planning
2. Education information systems
3. Dissemination of information
4. Education research and demonstration
5. Teacher preparation programs
6. Auxiliary education programs
7. Studies regarding financing of public education
8. Pupil achievement measurement programs
9. Consultative services to school districts
10. Evaluation-demonstration preschool programs

The survey showed 503 expenditures to be for:

1. Education information system - 16.8%
2. Educational planning - 15.2%
3. Inservice training - SEA and LEA - 13.6%
4. Research and demonstration - 13.2%
5. Consultative assistant to LEA - 12.4%
6. Dissemination of information - 7.6%
7. Curriculum development - 5.6
8. Teacher education - 5.2%
9. Measurement of pupil achievement - 4.4%
10. Auxiliary personnel - 1.2%
11. Preschool programs - 0.0%

The state educational agencies which responded to the survey indicated that any loss of federal funds to strengthen state educational agencies would diminish the capability to engage in research and demonstration (16.3%), inservice training (16.3%), information systems (12.5%), consultative and technical assistance (10.6%), educational planning (10.6%), statewide achievement measurement (8.7%), and dissemination of information (4.8%).

SEAs viewed the following areas as the finest and most important of their activities in 1972:

1. Information systems (14.9%)
2. Inservice education (14.3%)
3. Research and demonstration (14.4%)
4. Dissemination of information (8.17%)
5. Educational planning (12.6%)
6. Research and dissemination (8.1%)
7. Publication of curricular materials (6.9%)
8. Statewide pupil achievement (6.3%)
9. Finance studies (4.0%)

I don't believe I need to point out the inconsistencies of the order of rankings just cited to you. If one accepts the high national priority to find new ways to finance public education, how does this square with the performance on finance studies (a no show on spending habits) or the fact that SEA said such studies were their ninth order of most important things? This insensitivity to national priorities on the part of SEAs will probably allow the shakers and movers at the local and federal agencies to shape the immediate future course of events for SEAs and accounts for the fact that Joel Burke among others indicates that fiscal reform is coming about from outside interests.

The question quickly turns from history to future predictions of things to come. Future events are often determined by strong tides or waves which carry other things along with them. I believe the following are such kinds of forces:

1. While the rhetoric about home rule and local autonomy will continue, the trend toward state and federal priorities along with constitutional guarantees by the courts will find local isolationism giving way to these forces.

2. The legislative and congressional technical assistance staff will continue to increase in numbers and grow in power to shape legislation in all areas, including education. The state executive and budget offices will also grow in power and influence in the next decade. This growth and power will co-opt USOE and SEAs from their traditional influencing roles with congressmen and legislators.

3. The vast majority of the financial resources of state government will go toward meeting the cost of state public education fiscal reforms, property tax relief, and the needs of high-cost student populations.

4. The absence of a recognized effective coalition leadership at the national level for elementary and secondary education will probably mean that other special educational interest groups, especially higher education, will be more successful than fragmented public school groups who infrequently may find a common interest.

5. The public's interest in educational accountability will result in more public participation in educational decision-making, adoption of more complex budgeting systems, and the collection and analysis of more data to provide the public with the kind of information it wants about the progress and productivity of educational affairs.

6. The rapid growth of USOE and SEA staff and power in the 1960s has caused a resentful LEA and legislative backlash which will express continuation of this growth and power except in very selective areas such as handicapped education and evaluation.

In part on the preceding trends, I believe the future will find, among other things, many of the following:

1. Increasingly, the use of direct state bypass and formalized pass-thru funding will be provided to local school districts by the federal government. This appears to have the sympathy of congressional and federal administrative leaders. As a result, USOE will assume greater, not less, prescription of administrative control in more programs via rules and regulations in the Federal Register, SEAs will increasingly contract with USOE for monitoring and evaluation roles.

2. Large LEAs will become the site for investments in experimentation and change by USOE and NIE in an effort to improve education. These districts will find eager participants at universities and colleges who will become the base for support and assistance in this area rather than to SEAs.

3. LEAs will slowly begin to adopt new decision-making technologies and participants in their operations. SEAs will be required to take on development of special systems, aid in local staff training, and collect more and more program, performance, evaluation, and fiscal information. The SEA will be required to monitor acceptable patterns of performance by local units to determine how well goals are being achieved.

4. LEAs will increasingly assign some of their educational programs and services to the nonpublic sector and to business and industry in an effort to find and provide alternatives to better meet the needs of all children.

5. SEAs will be required to accommodate the cost of services related to new priorities from status quo services and old priorities with, as many of you may suspect, considerable internal staff and organizational strife. Federal priorities and funds will continue to influence the role and services from state agencies. Discretionary services in SEAs will diminish in favor of state priorities, and intermediate units and LEAs will be required to provide or contract for technical and special assistance formerly received from the SEAs.

6. SEAs will expand technical assistance to LEAs in the areas of evaluation, talented and gifted, career education, handicapped and disadvantaged students; collection of information; revised state aid formula administration; due processes; affirmative action; and the dissemination of research information.

7. SEAs will be required to analyze, plan, and implement methods to distribute under approved formula the federal funds available to the state according to the wealth of a district, its fiscal effort, and the cost of unique educational needs in order to fulfill constitutional guarantees that no child is denied educational opportunities for lack of wealth in the district of his residence.

8. SEAs will be required to provide more and more technical assistance and information to state and congressional legislative staff study groups for political decision-making. USOE will be much more attentive to the will of Congress, and LEAs will be the source of data that will meet the need of both USOE and SEA.

9. SEAs will establish more administrative machinery to handle the due process needs of increasingly militant LEAs. This will also stretch to LEAs and USOE as well. LEAs will militantly demand their rights in the face of more pre-empting decisions or limits from upper levels. Citizens will increasingly appeal the actions taken by local officials.

10. USOE will operate more and more national centers for the collection and dissemination of program information to help SEAs and LEAs obtain data to plan programs to meet their needs. SEAs will become distributors of this information to LEAs. The concept of informational linkage mechanisms will find its way into practice in order to provide this information to classroom teachers.

11. Subtle changes will occur in the nature of educational leadership. The old peer partnership relationships between USOE, SEAs and LEAs will break down, as it already has at the local level, between classroom teachers and administrators.

12. These new thrusts are likely to ride on the crests of political populism. The Congress, state executive offices, and state legislatures will assume greater powers and responsibilities in the future. Political power often rides along with the distribution of funds and the assumption of new leadership functions. This suggests that there will be legislative attempts to co-opt educational leadership and power of at least the USOE and SEA educational partners. This probably means that state and federal agencies will increasingly become executors of legislative will and power and diminish traditional educational professional peer roles between LEA, SEA, and USOE.

This can already be observed in the activities of special commissions, task forces, budget offices, special grants administrations, establishment of special offices, and increased legislative administrative machinery. Education's partnership may face the same kind of a situation Winget referred to for governors and chief state school officers when he stated, "Too often (they) tend to be listening to different drummers as they come face to face with problems affecting education."(6)

13. The National Institute of Education and a National Center for Education Statistics is likely to be vested with an evaluative accountability role to conduct special studies, evaluate program effectiveness, design new learning systems, etc.

It must be obvious that there are shades between the dimensions of change that I believe will be forthcoming in the future. It must also be obvious that this will arrive at different times in different states. It is likely some change will come about by default of the agencies themselves. To be otherwise would require SEAs to become <u>pro-active</u> rather than <u>reactive</u> agents.

REFERENCES

1. Roe L. Johns, "State Organization and Responsibilities for Education," in Edgar Morphet and Charles Ryan, eds., Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society (New York: Citation Press, 1967), pp. 245-266.

2. Roald Campbell, Gerald Sroufe and Donald Layton, Strengthening State Departments of Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967), p. 84.

3. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Random House, Bantam Books, 1970), p. 32.

4. C. Philip Kearney, "The Politics of Educational Assessment in Michigan," Planning and Changing, I:2 (July 1970), pp. 71-82.

5. Education Daily, 18 September 1972, p. 4.

6. Lerue Winget, Edgar Fuller and Terrel Bell, "State Departments of Education Within State Governments," in Edgar Fuller and Jim Pearson, eds., Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900, Vol. 2 (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969), p. 117.

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY

Prepared by

B. G. Pauley, Director
Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project

(DISTRIBUTE THE BOOKLETS. EXPLAIN THAT THEY WILL BE USED LATER ON IN THE PRESENTATION).

Someone has said that the trouble with the schools is that the teachers are afraid of the principal; the principal is afraid of the superintendent; the superintendent is afraid of the board; the board is afraid of the parents; the parents are afraid of their children; and the kids aren't scared of anything. I suppose that this statement could be generalized even further to include state departments of education, state boards and state legislatures. How much truth there is in the statement, I'll let you judge. But, the statement does point out very succinctly that the success, or failure, of the public schools rests on more than one group. If we are to have an equitable accountability system, all who share responsibility should be accountable -- each for his share!

Educators appear to be apt to go from one catch phrase to another. Accountability may be the latest in a long series of "kicks" that we have been on, and the term may be replaced by "performance based", for example, or some other term. On the other hand, it may be here to stay, at least until the circumstances that brought it to the foreground are resolved. Some factors that have contributed to the demand for accountability are --

1. The increasing costs of public education. Costs have increased dramatically due to at least two factors: First, as we all know, all costs have increased; and second, teachers have demanded to be paid as professionals. Education is big business. In fact in most states, costs for public education represent the biggest expenditure in the state budget. This aspect is treated more extensively in the handout you have been given.

2. Dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the public schools expressed by such diverse groups as The Council for Basic Education, opponents of sex education, opponents of the new math, organizers of storefront schools, proponents of law and order, Americanism, racial integration, physical education, religious worship, etc. Part of the demand for accountability may stem from the diverse responsibilities that schools have accepted. An institution that has tried to do everything, logically could not be expected to do everything well.

3. Resistance to change -- the cliche that, "The best teaching machine is one whose measurements are 36-24-36", is more than an attempt to deride technology. It is indicative of the fact that we still operate schools in pretty much the same way as in the time of Horace Mann. Television, teaching machines, etc., have come on the scene with "great potential", In the main they still have "great potential", because their potential has not been used. The last technological advance that has found general acceptance in the schools is the blackboard, which replaced the slate.

4. Failure of educators to communicate. To a degree at least, schools have come to be operated by educators according to a Gnostic wisdom. The role of parents is viewed as supplying children and money; communication is one way too many times. In fact this philosophy of education can lead, and one could have to conclude that in some cases that it has done so, to the conclusion that the schools exist for the convenience of the teachers and school administrators.

The foregoing recitation could probably be matched by other reasons, equally valid to some people but disputed by others. In any event we have been hearing accountability for some time, and the term has lasted longer than "educational renewal" at least. I have a file into which I put things concerning accountability -- not everything; just things that appear to be significant or a good resource. That file is "yea thick", and a check as I prepared these remarks showed it to contain items from 1971 to the present. So accountability is three years old at least -- actually much older of course -- and the subject has generated a good body of

literature. You have been supplied with a bibliography that will verify this fact.

I believe that our "three-year old" is here to stay, at least for a few years longer; that it won't just go away; that it won't do much good to fight it; that we should do more than just swim with the current; that public education, as any other agency spending public funds, should be accountable; and that as professionals we should join the accountability movement and shape it so that a more efficient educational system will result in a better educated citizenry. I do not believe that accountability will result in lower costs or that it should result only in poor teachers or administrators getting fired. I find many persons, groups and agencies to have responsibilities for public education. All who share in responsibilities should likewise be held accountable. Thus, we in the Mid-Atlantic Project have accepted the concept of shared accountability.

Accountability is defined by Webster as the quality or state of being accountable, liable, or responsible. Accountability is described also in the New Testament in the parable of the talents. You will recall that when the Master returned from his travels he demanded an accounting from the servants and when he found that the one servant had buried his talent, he reproved him, took the sum from him, and gave it to the servant who had had the greatest increase.

The participants in the Mid-Atlantic Project have chosen -- as you can see on page VI of your handout -- to define shared accountability as the mutual acceptance of responsibilities for accomplishing, and reporting on, specified student outcomes. This means, as we see it, agreement on the part of all agencies, groups, and individuals, as to roles and responsibilities for public education, and a willingness on the part of each to be held accountable for his share. We admit that this may be easier said than done, but we believe that such agreement is a necessary part of an accountability system. It makes no sense to hold the teachers and principal responsible if the board failed to provide needed facilities or the board responsible if the legislature failed to provide the proper funds, or if a court limited its

authority, etc. The trouble with the schools is that the teachers are afraid of the principal; the principal is afraid of the superintendent . . . The remedy is for all of them to recognize that they are engaged in a common endeavor and that each, including "the kids", has certain responsibilities. That, as we see it, is what shared accountability is all about.

An accountability system entails reporting on progress toward stated objectives. The objectives, in turn, must be measurable and the results reported in an intelligible manner. Evaluation is an intimate part of assuming accountability. The trouble with evaluation is that everyone wants to evaluate someone else, but no one is likely to be happy about being evaluated himself, especially if the results are to be reported. The principal is usually willing to evaluate the teachers; the teachers are certainly willing to evaluate the pupils; and the board is anxious to evaluate the superintendent. Try, however, to get the board to set up a procedure for evaluating itself or the teachers association to develop an evaluation plan for the teachers, and you may find some change of attitude toward evaluation. We recognize this as a hurdle. Yet we maintain that accountability cannot be something that applies only to other people -- only to a portion of those who are responsible for educational accomplishment.

We have prepared the loose-leaf publication which you have been given. (DISPLAY BOOK) We have prepared also posters, charts, leaflets and a slide-tape presentation. They are intended to be useful in communicating the concept of shared accountability. We are using them in our states -- as is and also as adapted to our particular needs.

One of our states -- NORTH CAROLINA -- has produced a slide-tape to explain the concept as part of its inservice training program. We are indebted to Dr. H.T. Conner and his staff for making a special effort to have it ready in time for this meeting.

SHOW SLIDE-TAPE

I now call your attention to the booklets which have been distributed. I am going to take you through an exercise in shared accountability training. You will find a score sheet inserted in the front of your booklet. As I show the transparencies please score each responsibility as "high", "medium", "low", or "blank" for each of the agencies or groups at the head of the column.

(EXERCISE: HAVE PARTICIPANTS RATE RESPONSIBILITIES AS TRANSPARENCIES ARE SHOWN).

(DISCUSSION).

(ANNOUNCEMENT). Some additional materials are available regarding this publication, but not in quantity -- direct inquiries to me. Direct inquiries regarding the slide-tape presentation to Dr. H.T. Conner, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

PRESENTATION FOR NATIONAL INTERSTATE CONFERENCE
HOWARD JOHNSON'S MOTOR LODGE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA -- May 1-2, 1974

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF MULTI-PURPOSE GRANTS

by

Ernest E. Lehr

These days your attention is directed toward mismanagement, confusion, terror, and other unpleasantness. However, I propose that we are meeting together undergirded by a substantial foundation of trust in our national institutions and in ourselves. Our purpose is to better serve our children to make the future better. Yet, we are faced with an expiration date for programs which are landmarks of determination to provide these services. In brief, there is not much point in talking about better planning and improved targeting of resources if there will be no programs after June 30. I am sure you will agree that we are operating on a basis of trust and confidence that these programs will be extended and that the agencies which administer the funds are under the direction of persons who share our confidence and trust. Furthermore, that they like us, are endeavoring to be good stewards.

Education is a state responsibility. Each state may delegate a varying degree of administrative authority to the local or intermediate agency. The Federal government has made available a small amount of financial support in accordance with specific national concerns and priorities. However, the state is the key to management of the public education system in the United States.

During the course of the last few years, the federal government has enacted in a piecemeal fashion a number of programs to provide financial support for education. The cumulative effect is to distort the traditional and constitutional state-level relationship. Certain Federal programs require Federal officials to deal directly and exclusively with state officials or agencies. Some involve direct Federal-local relationships with little or no state involvement. Some Federal funds flow

through state agencies to local school districts with varying degrees of state influence or control. A few Federal programs, particularly the impacted aid program, even go so far as to disequalize state school finance programs.

Another distortion takes place within education itself. The categorical nature of many federal programs inevitably has led to the creation of special-interest groups within state and local education agencies, each determined to maintain the narrow focus of its specialty while expanding its influence. These groups compete not only with one another but with state and local administrators responsible for coordinating all programs for children. Some state and local officials work more closely with Federal officials than with people in their own agencies, often managing Federal funds in isolation from state and local resources available for the same purposes.

In addition, Federal programs have tended to be administratively time-consuming and expensive in proportion to the return. The delivery system for the existing maze of programs, involving separate schedules, plans, guidelines, regulations, forms and evaluations for each program, is so complex that state and local education agencies find it impossible to coordinate and concentrate Federal funds effectively. Most state education agencies and many local school districts have been compelled to hire Federal aid experts, specialists in education grantsmanship.

It is inevitable that proposals should be advanced recommending that the number of Federal school aid programs be consolidated and simplified and that the administrative procedures surrounding these programs be overhauled. The simplification or consolidation should not be described as simple grant consolidation nor should it be described as revenue sharing. It is not that simple and it is much more important.

In the Spring of 1972, eight states joined with OE in a Title V project to explore the feasibility of using a single application from local educational agencies in

soliciting financial assistance from several Federal categorical programs. Each of the eight states has explored aspects of the single application. Several states have developed forms and used consolidated applications with a limited number of school districts as a pilot phase and one state has involved all districts in the state.

Efforts by the states have paralleled standardization and consolidation evidenced in OMB Circulars A-87 and A-102 and in pending legislation such as H.R. 69 and S. 1539.

Representatives of the participating states concluded that a consolidated application form and process is feasible. It is feasible even under existing legislative and regulative constraints.

Representatives of the participating states concluded that use of a consolidated application is advantageous. It leads to improved management and improved utilization of funds and services for priority needs.

Application models developed by the states need revision to reflect experience of the prior year and must be updated according to legislation and regulations now pending. Further work is necessary.

Coordination of various program officers in LEA, SEA, and OE offices has been a problem when consolidation of an application form is attempted. Comprehensive planning and allocation of resources requires improved coordination of program officers at every level. Several problem areas have been identified and need to be addressed in concert.

With these conclusions in mind, let me identify the persons and states which have participated in the project and review briefly steps each state has taken to

affirm the feasibility of comprehensive planning and consolidated grants management involving a single application mechanism.

California	Ernest Lehr
Delaware	John Ryan, William Rementer
Florida	Marshall Frinks
Minnesota	Pete Petrafeso, Gayle Anderson, Ed Cain, Art Bilyen, Jerome Webster
Oklahoma	Earl Cross, James Casey, Jack Strahorn
Utah	Bernarr Furse
Vermont	Leon Bruno, Catherine Corcoran, Patricia Townsend
Washington	Gerald Carlstrom, Rich Boyd, James Oeschner

Liaison and assistance to the project from the Office of Education was provided by Dexter Magers.

California:

In 1969 the State Assembly passed a resolution to require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a consolidated application for Federal and state categorical aid programs and to develop improved administrative procedures. The Superintendent appointed a task force composed of Federal, State Department, and other state agency and local educational agency representatives. By 1971 an application form and instructions had been prepared and the Department was in position to accept applications on a pilot basis. Although only compensatory education programs were included in the application, the seventeen pilot districts ranged in size from Los Angeles to a small rural school district in the northern part of the state.

During 1972-73 an improved application form and instructions were used by the original districts as well as a new group of 19 districts in Sacramento County. However, all districts in the state were exposed to the concept because the application form was used as the standard form for ESEA II, NDEA III, and EHA VI-B programs. The application form and manual of instructions included special provisions to meet statutory or regulation requirements for these programs.

In 1973-74 the consolidated application was used in California by almost every one of its 1100 districts for categorical aid programs which totaled approximately $275,000,000. In addition to Federal programs such as Part B of Vocational Education; ESEA, Title I; ESEA, Title II; and NDEA, Title III; the following state programs were also included: Special Teacher Employment, Educationally Disadvantaged Youth, Early Childhood Education, Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics, and the Miller-Unruh Reading Program. It was determined to expand the consolidated application process because of the overlap of program purpose and the similarity in requirements for advisory committees, needs assessments, and evaluation designs. To assist districts, a systematic program of orientation and technical assistance was provided by specially trained task force teams. Although the time availably to mount this trust was limited and obstacles were encountered, it is generally recognized to be an improvement over the prior mode of operation.

It is important to note that the Department's representative to this project circulated program reports and materials from the project and could provide other support. Other Department staff and representatives from the consolidated application task force pilot districts attended a project meeting and, along with details about the process, conveyed the idea that the concept was feasible. In addition, a representative from the Office of Management and Budget came to Sacramento to conduct a seminar on the Integrated Grants Management program. This seminar was attended by representatives from other project states and by executive staff of the California Department of Education.

The California Department of Education is committed to the consolidated grants management concept and is proceeding with refinements and plans for the next fiscal year. The Department has reorganized into more functional units which are

consistent with the major elements of the application. Efforts are under way to consolidate all regulations, guidelines, and administrative directives for those programs. An evaluation procedure for multifunded programs has been prepared. Continuing technical assistance is being provided to local educational agencies. A commission of the State Board of Education has conducted hearings and will soon make recommendations regarding the concept and process. In an era of continuing shortage of resources for education, comprehensive planning and evaluation as embodied in the consolidated application process are described as essential. The Department has received inquiries from other states and will continue to support the project and other states in this effort.

Delaware:

Like California, Delaware had two years experience in coordination of federal programs before participation in this project. As a result of this project Delaware contracted for development of a consolidated application form and manual. It was expected that the form would allow for inclusion of all programs. However, only ESEA I, ESEA II, ESEA III, NDEA III, and Vocational Education programs were specifically listed in the proposed application form. A grants management procedure and handbook for processing a consolidated application have been developed. Local educational agencies have participated in developing the application and procedures but have not elected to employ the form as yet. Districts are analyzing needs on a comprehensive basis and these results will be collected and analyzed by the Delaware Department of Education.

Florida:

The Florida Department of Education in the CoGram activity indicates its concern with assisting the LEA's with district comprehensive planning. This involvement is a result of an action by the 1972 legislature which mandates that each district

which participates in state appropriations for foundation programs will provide evidence of its effort to maintain an adequate school program by conducting an ongoing systematic evaluation of the current educational program and needs in that district. In view of this mandate, for comprehensive planning at the local district level, the state has been divided into five regions and a technical assistance team has been assigned to work with the local school districts in each region in the development of comprehensive plans. Teams will be composed of 10 to 12 educators representing backgrounds and specialities in curriculum, vocational education and special education. These teams will assist the LEA to do comprehensive planning by assisting them with needs assessment, developing programs based on these needs, and the establishment and writing of objectives to meet the goals of these programs.

Concurrent with its work in comprehensive planning, Florida's Department of Education is developing a new accounting system for Florida's public school districts, a cost analysis management information system (CAMIS). This activity provides cost analysis techniques which make it possible to relate costs to the attainment of educational objectives. At the present time several pilot projects have been initiated, a series of orientation workshops have been held and drafts of CAMIS distributed as the developmental work progressed.

Minnesota:

The Minnesota State educational agency has conducted a feasibility study to determine the opportunities for program consolidation within the existing agency structure. An intensive review of the entire SEA organization is being conducted with a view toward reorganization. This activity is a component of the Governor's effort to review and reorganize all state government operations.

Minnesota has involved a State Department of Education advisory committee and a group of representatives from the 13 local educational agencies participating in the study of consolidated grants management and the development of a consolidated application form. The SEA will move to develop a delivery system for providing technical assistance to LEA's willing to participate further in CoGram and the pilot grants management process. Technical assistance will be provided by SEA personnel in the area of comprehensive district-wide needs assessment, planning and evaluation.

Oklahoma:

Prior to involvement in the CoGram project, Oklahoma was working on a consolidated information system. An LEA report form for all federal programs was developed. The report form was designed to present information useful to the management of all federal programs operated in Oklahoma schools. Work on the consolidated information system is continuing. Plans are going forward to use the computer in the information collection and utilization system. The system would include certification, needs assessment, statistical data, community involvement, planning, evaluation, dissemination, staffing, and equiping, and budgeting. A pilot consolidated information system utilizing the computer is expected to begin in FY-1974 with as many as 50 LEA's participating.

The focus of CoGram in Oklahoma is the development of a Consolidated Program Document while the work on information consolidation continues. All federal programs from which the school districts are receiving funds are included in the program document. Five school districts have been selected to participate in a pilot program for the 1973-74 school year. The SEA has been working with the pilot schools in the development of a consolidated program document and will continue to provide technical assistance to them.

Utah:

Prior to CoGram, Utah has been involved in coordinating federal programs. However, no efforts were directed toward the development of a consolidated application or grants management process. The federal programs involved with the CoGram activity include ESEA Titles I, II, III, and EHA Title VI-B, and Vocational Education. Departmental personnel from these programs have been involved in the developmental process of the consolidated application form.

Utah has conducted a review of the current application forms and procedures for federal and state programs and has determined to adopt a model similar to one of those developed by California or Washington. CoGram activity in Utah is primarily geared toward the development of a consolidated application process, though there is expressed interest in the development of regional comprehensive plans on a statewide basis.

Vermont:

The Vermont Department of Education was involved in coordination and fund consolidation activities prior to the advent of CoGram. The creation of the office of the Federal programs through departmental reorganization has brought Title I, Title II, Title III, of ESEA and Title III NDEA under the jurisdiction of one office. These programs are also participating in the pilot consolidation application process.

The CoGram activity in Vermont will include a comprehensive district-wide planning effort. The pilot program is expected to provide a variety of approaches as these districts proceed with their district-wide planning and utilize the consolidated application form. The SEA will provide on-site technical assistance for the schools participating in the pilot effort with the consolidated applica-

tion form. It is anticipated that when all LEA's become involved in the grants consolidation process that it may pose a problem for the SEA in providing technical assistance simply because of the limited number of available SEA personnel. Vermont has held training sessions with the LEA's concerning needs assessment, establishment of goals and objectives. On-site technical assistance were provided during the month of March and proposals were submitted by May 1, 1973 for FY-1974. The grants consolidation process includes an evaluation monitoring visits, evaluation by a person external to the district and on-site team visits. A comprehensive monitoring system has been developed for use with CoGram activities.

Washington:

The State Department of Education in Washington began four years ago to consolidate federally funded programs. The State Department has undergone organizational changes to create a grants management section composed of functionally related units. The federal programs included in CoGram are ESEA Title I, basic Title I, migrant, ESEA Title II, ESEA Title III, and NDEA Title III-A and Johnson-O'Malley funds. Two state funded programs are included: funds for gifted and compensatory education. The time frame for the CoGram activities has included the developmental year 1971-72, the first pilot year 1972-73 which involved 12 districts, and expansion of the pilot phase in 1973-74 to involve 19 LEA's. The projected time line calls for all LEA's in the State of Washington to be involved in the consolidated grants management effort by FY 1976. Washington specifically attempted to develop a consolidated application (CONSOLAP) and management system. A Standard Operations Manual (SOM) has been developed for use by both the grants management section and the local participating LEA's. The SOM provides explicit instructions for developing the CONSOLAP and the grants management process.

The grants management process includes the provision of technical assistance by the SEA to the LEA's, a review process for the application, project monitoring, reporting, evaluation, dissemination, fiscal and program auditing, and delivery of a final product. These subsystems which comprise the grants management process are in various stages of development and are continually being revised during the pilot phase. The LEA's participating in the consolidation of federal and state grants may utilize the grants management process for any single categorical aid or may apply for funds by submitting the CONSOLAP and pursuing the grants management process for all of the categorical programs. It is anticipated Title III ESEA, Title III NDEA, and Title II ESEA will require additional information and special handling.

State Agency Administration

Project representatives have concluded that participation in the process to comprehensively plan for the utilization of the variety of categorical funding sources requires, first of all, a commitment at the top executive level of the state education agency. Support for the individual programs has established substantial interest groups who need to be assured that the thrust of comprehensive planning resulting in a common application form will make for better and more efficient utilization of resources without in any way detracting from the importance of the original program. For this reason, it is important to establish a state education advisory committee which includes top management, program people, financial people, and, above all, representatives from local educational agencies. What each state should do depends on that state's plan. Each state education agency differs, the clientele in each state will differ, each state has a different number of school districts. Therefore, it is essential that the advisory group develop their own plan and arrangement for this effort. Materials and insights in other

states should be utilized just as any research utilizes results of previous investigations. In general, the delivery system in each agency has certain basic components. It is expected that each state education agency will have a unit specializing in the financial aspects of grants management, the curriculum and program concerns, an evaluation and test section, and possibly a unit dealing with community/nonpublic school intergroup relations concerns. These functions may occur in a number of divisions. For example, each of the above functions could occur in a unit dealing only with compensatory education. It is expected that there will be a program manager with specific responsibilities for administration of certain categorical funds. It is also possible that the staff in the above functions can be organized into teams which provide services to the regions within the state. There may be three teams. For example, a team charged with responsibility for development of applications and programs. A second team would conduct on-site reviews to determine whether or not the activities conform to the application as approved. The third team could identify and document for dissemination exemplary programs. All of the above functions are important. However, they all involve people. Personnel management interests and concerns require the best in personnel management.

The project has developed a core of knowledge which can be available to you if you request it.

CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS' PRIORITIES

A COMMITTEE REPORT

As a result of the National Interstate Conference for ESEA Title V, Section 505, a committee was appointed to consider the recommendations of the CSSO's priorities for 505 Projects. The committee reviewed the findings of a survey conducted under Superintendent Louis J. Michot's direction to poll the Chiefs' opinions regarding the future direction for the Interstate Projects. The following list indicates a set of resolutions formulated by that committee and adopted by the state representatives attending the conference.

- Establish a National Policy Board to coordinate the efforts of all 505 Projects for the best interests and benefit of CSSO's
- Re-validate the data of the national survey by means of a second survey to consolidate the CSSO's priorities into a top priority ranking
- Introduce recommendations to CSSO's and 505 representatives as a result of the Priority Survey of CSSO's
- Recommend that Congress incorporate the necessary legislation and funding to continue the 505 Projects or similar special projects
- Determine alternate methods of funding for the continuance of 505 Projects or similar special projects

- Strengthen the 505 Projects through the involvement and continued commitment of the CSSO's
- Establish a working relationship with the CSSO's and the National Institute of Education
- Develop a process for successful follow-up procedures of present 505 Projects and means of implementation for adequate long-range planning
- Determine a means for a national evaluation of 505 Projects

Planning in State Education Agencies: The Next Step

by
Dr. William M. Timmins

The interstate project "Planning in the State and Local Education Agency: The Next Step" was jointly funded by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, and the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education of the U. S. Office of Education. Five states, (Georgia, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin), and dozens of LEA's were involved in the effort 1971-1974.

The project tested two key theses: (1) planning and evaluation are extremely useful management tools, and SEA's (and LEA's) can improve management decision-making by improving the processes of planning and evaluation; and (2) SEA's can make significant impact upon improving education for children in classrooms by technical and financial assistance to LEA's to help them acquire the necessary competencies in planning and evaluation.

"Next Step" has proved the validity of both theses. Two quotes from a couple of CSSO's of participating states may help to illustrate the point:

> [Project Next Step] led to a reconsideration of the nature and role of planning within this agency; it has made possible new cooperative efforts and relationships with the Cooperative Educational Service Agencies and local school districts in the state; and it has resulted in the training of personnel and the development and dissemination of planning materials and techniques on a broad scale.
>
> --Dr. Barbara Thompson, State Superintendent
> Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

> Georgia's participation in Project Next Step has helped my staff and me develop a "mutuality of planning" concept, which, I believe, will lead to improved educational opportunities for public school students in this State.*** To me, the stage is now set for our next steps. Beginning with FY 75, I will provide the needed staff and some financial assistance to those local school district superintendents and their boards who want to begin developing an overall plan for their operation.***

I envision the product of these . . . Next Steps to be greater flexibility for local superintendents and their boards to make decisions.

--Dr. Jack P. Nix, State Superintendent
Georgia Department of Education

Next Step trained participants in rather orthodox planning processes--e.g., identify problems (needs assessment), define them, analyze them (system analysis), generate alternative solutions, select the best solution-strategy, and evaluate and revise as necessary. The emphasis throughout was upon "mutuality of planning" -- that is, involving all persons and groups involved in the outputs in the various inputs. For example, an assessment of educational needs (statewide, or at the LEA level) should involve federal, state, and local groups (the vertical dimension); and persons across program and agency lines at each level (the horizontal dimension). Another example might be seen in the selection of the "best" solution-strategy -- this process must involve key decision makers at various levels, not just planning staffs or groups of professionals. In essence, planning was treated as a relatively simple, straightforward management tool to assist decision makers in setting goals, understanding issues, choosing among alternatives, and so on.

A principal of an elementary school in an urban area who actively participated in the project wrote the following:

As the district has continued to move in the direction indicated by Next Step and more opportunities to receive training have been offered, I have found myself becoming more comfortable with the Systems Approach [the Next Step "model" of systematic educational planning]. I look at my problems differently. They seem to stay in perspective and I think more of them are solved. My use of the Systems Approach is more informal than formal--I don't have to beat the bushes to find the needs--they pretty well identify themselves. The fundamental change at Lynn School lies in the fact that we feel we are "on target". We are demanding more of ourselves because, I believe, we see our needs more clearly. It will take some time before we are fully converted and understand the process. I would agree with you that the Systems Approach does "pay off". I do not have mathematical evidence of significance, but subjectively the following are true:

A. Parent interest and participation is high.
B. Children's performance is very good in most areas and they seem happy.
C. Teacher morale is high.
D. We are becoming excited about "measurable objectives".

So while project Next Step frustrated us, and I still don't know all I should know about it, it has indeed changed my method of administering the Lynn School.

---Dorothy Bushell, Principal, Lynn School
Ogden School District (Utah)

Such "testimonials" as the above are only intended to illustrate the success of the overriding objective of Next Step--to demonstrate that planning and evaluation "pay off," that is, they improve the quality of education for children.

SEA's were asked to assess the status of planning and identify areas where changes were needed, and then to develop plans to move the SEA from where it was to where it wanted to be. An instrument was developed by project management (in collaboration with a consultant firm, Worldwide Education and Research Institute of Salt Lake City) which was used in all participating SEA's and many of the LEA's. While the reception to the Criteria for Agency Planning: An Instrument for the Assessment of State and Local Planning in Education (1973, 75 pp.) was mixed, each SEA did conduct a self-assessment of its own planning process and product. Some fully used the instrument, other SEA's only field tested it, but used their own devices or criteria afterwards. The results of such SEA self-examination are quite revealing.

However, it was apparent from these efforts at self-assessment that educational planners are not as effective as they could be in assisting decision makers. Many SEA's consider planning as an "art" and neglect the "science" of planning. Others slavishly follow a process and appear to neglect the "art" of successfully working within a certain institutional framework. But SEA self-assessments generally revealed that they just don't use all the planning and evaluation understanding and expertise they have. Typically SEA's are vague on objectives for their educational systems! SEA's are not very effective in distinguishing between learner needs and institutional needs! They don't target very well (which students? how many? how identify them?)! Then seldom analyze missions for "whats" but immediately select "hows"! SEA planning is clearly inadequate in many areas where management needs help!

In 1968 a 505 interstate project issued a report Comprehensive Planning in State Education Agencies (Bernarr S. Furse, Editor, Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City) in which seven participating SEA's documented their efforts at developing comprehensive educational planning systems.

Typically, each of those seven SEA's had developed formal organizational arrangements for planning (e.g., Puerto Rico's "Policy Planning Committee"; Iowa's "cabinet"; Colorado's "Planning Council"; Texas'"Agency Planning Council"; and so forth).

In Project Next Step, all the participating SEA's had likewise developed such planning mechanisms and organizational infrastructures before the beginning of the project. SEA self-assessment of these mechanisms and organizational arrangements was brutally frank. One SEA discovered:

> For a three-year period, extending from 1969-1972, a "Planning Council" met monthly to review proposed plans and make recommendations about actions, which should be taken with respect to these plans. Many plans were quite sophisticated, and the recommendations regarding them were developed only after thoughtful review by Council members. The group itself was composed of Division Directors and their most able advisors in the Department of Education. They proposed 58 formal recommendations for action which were transmitted upward to the next level of management, the Superintendent's Executive Committee, for their action. An assessment of the record reveals that no formal action was taken by the Executive Committee on any of the Planning Council's recommendations.

Such self-assessment by each of the participating SEA's in "Next Step" led to rigorous efforts to identify areas where change was needed and to change the SEA so that planning was more "plugged in" to agency decision making. One SEA, for example, performed some radical surgery by abolishing the existing planning council and appointing a "Next Step" task force to identify what ought to be done once areas of concern had been identified. Another SEA wrote,

> We believe that the single most important step we made during the project was the movement away from a planning system that we as planners had adopted, and the movement toward a management support

concept which provides decision makers with the help they need to arrive at decisions about direction.

Unfortunately, space here does not permit a complete analysis of the "next steps" in SEA planning which were taken by each project state. By July of this year the Final Report of Project Next Step will be available in print and ought to be of great interest to SEA planners.

Another major thrust of Project Next Step was in the area of SEA assistance to LEA's (sort of a precursor to ESEA Title V, Part C). An outside evaluation of the Project (by Dr. Paul M. Smith, President of Consalt, Inc., Salt Lake City) documented this portion of the project as highly successful in most cases. LEA's are eager to acquire effective management tools and techniques. The use of planning and evaluation tools and techniques offer genuine help to LEA administrators. One lengthy quote from the participating Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA #6) in Wisconsin demonstrates the outcomes of SEA assistance provided under the project as follows:

> The LEA needs assessments and related activities completed during a period of 2 1/2 years have provided the following positive indicators regarding local/C.E.S.A. [regional] cooperative planning:
>
> 1. Local districts have a healthy interest in developing local planning capabilities, and local staff members, if provided time and limited assistance are capable of doing much of the planning needed at the local level.
> 2. A number of local districts can work together and plan cooperatively in areas of mutual need, interest, and concern if each district is given the opportunity to set and maintain local direction; establish local schedules; and utilize personnel and supportive materials in ways which best serve specific local purposes.
> 3. Because most Wisconsin districts are of small enrollment size, and are unlikely to need or be able to financially support full-time planning personnel, there appears to be reasonable opportunity for such services to be made available to LEA's through voluntary, cooperative C.E.S.A. [regional] programs.
> 4. Staff training efforts and skills, while perhaps focused initially in only one limited area, quickly appear in additional areas and demonstrate the ability of staff members to apply new knowledge in a variety of situations far beyond the original area of application.

5. Planning cannot be isolated from evaluation and just as great need, interest, and potential exist in improving planning capabilities at the LEA level, so a similar situation exists in the area of evaluation.
6. Most district administrators, school board members, and staff members found that the involvement of the community in local needs studies was a positive and productive experience. Not only were community attitudes, values, evaluations, and expectations gathered and analyzed in an orderly manner, but the extra benefits of improved school-community relations were an unexpected and welcome result of the LEA efforts.

In summary, it is evident in C.E.S.A. 6 that the project was valuable in many ways, including the realization that the project efforts were just the initial, faltering steps that had to be taken before more serious and sophisticated planning efforts could be proposed or initiated.

Project Next Step has demonstrated the utility and value of SEA's providing technical assistance in educational planning and evaluation to LEA's. The Oregon SEA, for example, used project funds to provide a series of training workshops in planning for LEA leadership and teachers, including resource materials developed by project management and its consulting firm. The Area II Superintendent of the Portland Public Schools wrote:

> In our judgment the modest federal funding of "Next Step" is touching in a very positive way the lives of thousands of youngsters in our schools. We see progress in three categories as a result of our participation [with the SEA in training in planning and evaluation]. All are original goals of the project:
>
> 1. Improved planning capability in the [LEA] office and in individual schools.
> 2. Improved curriculum and instruction in special education and career education.
> 3. A more integrated approach to instruction [Mutuality of Planning] resulting from the view that career education and special education are a part of general education.
>
> Naturally, much progress in two and three above can be attributed to item one, planning.

In Summary, one U.S. Office of Education project officer said, "The real value of Next Step is not the models produced but the efforts to improve management. That's what we need to share with other SEA's." In the words of Utah's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Walter D. Talbot,

> The project tested the thesis that systematic educational planning "pays off"—that is, children in classrooms will benefit from the improved management and decisionmaking which results from improved planning and evaluation by educational leaders. "Project Next Step"

demonstrated that systematic educational planning results in better identification of priorities; more extensive consideration of alternatives; improved selection of strategies for implementation; and more systematic evaluation. The conclusion was clear--educational agencies which plan well will serve children more effectively.

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY: PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL

Historically, the state education agency has had a limited evaluative role in education. Major decisions about the educational process have been left to the local education agency with the state serving in consultative roles. SEA's have been involved in evaluation exercises in relation to accreditation. But this procedure has not been especially penetrating in that they generally examined staff, facilities, equipment, materials, and a perfunctory analysis of the products of the school. Almost any district can meet minimum standards and in most situations where accreditation is not given, it is a conscious decision by the local district not to meet minimum standards.

State education agencies and local school districts are now faced with a changing situation. Legislation has been passed in at least 27 states which has required statewide evaluation or assessment of public school programs. The state agencies must assume this new role as evaluation agents at a time when they are generally not prepared, and for which few models exist. The skills and the procedures must be gained quickly to meet the growing demands.

As a result, the Cooperative Accountability Project was initiated with seven cooperating states working closely with representatives of the U.S. Office of Education, theorists, and practitioners in developing a comprehensive accountability system which will serve as a model for implementation in other states.

Several aspects of accountability have been identified as essential to the development of an operational system. These components have been completed or are in the process of development in each of seven states.

CAP SERVICES

To assist the many states, education agencies, and individuals now involved in the educational accountability process, CAP has provided:

- a central office located and operated within the Colorado Department of Education. This office administers the various CAP activities.
- the State Educational Accountability Repository (SEAR), a CAP satellite managed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. SEAR serves as a central source of materials published throughout the United States concerning accountability practices and procedures. (Bibliographies are available for all interested individuals and groups.) SEAR also is a distribution center for CAP publications.
- major CAP publications dealing with various components of the accountability process. Based on in-depth studies by educational agencies in the seven cooperating CAP states, these publications include *Developing a Large Scale Assessment Program; Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation; Indicators and Statewide Assessment; Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education; Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability; State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education;* and *Keeping the Public Informed: Accent on Accountability.*
- audio-visual interpretations of key materials. Slide-tape and filmstrip programs translate the accountability message into a readily assimilated form.
- an information service. More than 15,000 requests have been filled concerning accountability in general... the Project specifically...publications created by CAP...and data accumulated by CAP.
- a mailing list of some 1,800 key names and locations. This list is used for periodic distribution of CAP materials and information.
- presentations at major conferences. Members of the CAP staff and Project Operations Board have introduced and described accountability at meetings of national and state education associations and organizations.
- coordination with numerous national organizations and groups to develop a better understanding of educational accountability.

- articles and press releases to major education journals and periodicals, CAP quarterly newsletters also have been issued.
- periodic evaluation of CAP activities and publications.

FUTURE CAP PROGRAMS

In addition to continuing previous efforts, CAP anticipates further activities in the areas of:

- additional key publications. These will include *Cost Pricing the Components of a Comprehensive Accountability System; Criterion Standards for the Components of an Accountability System;* and *Condition Variables in Relation to Measured Student Performance.*
- seminars and workshops to further basic understanding of accountability principles and to broaden their application in specific educational areas.
- continued expansion of the SEAR to serve state and local requirements. (Visitors are welcome.)
- regional and national conferences at which the many strands of the accountability fabric may be presented, viewed, analyzed, and strengthened.
- application of CAP publications and services in selected states and local educational agencies. Based on this application, a number of field studies will be made to determine the impact of accountability model efforts.
- cooperation with individuals and groups interested in determining the contribution that the accountability process can make to improved learning in American public education.

What will responsible educators find themselves doing in the months and years ahead? They'll be:

1. allocating time to assessing students' learning needs,
2. selecting or writing performance objectives based on agreed upon educational goals,

3. collecting and analyzing student outcome measures,

4. modifying instructional plans and processes based on these outcome measures, and

5. reporting the results to all concerned.

To do all of this, personnel should be trained and they should be dedicated to the proposition that improvements in education can and must be made. It means increasing our competence to do the job to which we have been assigned and for which we are responsible, and for which we are accountable. To do less is to short-change the boys and girls of this nation. "Effective Evaluation in Education" will become a reality only when the concepts are communicated to the school administrator and to the classroom teacher in terms of the purpose, process, time and materials needed to bring about improvements in the instructional program at the classroom level.

In order for the Cooperative Accountability Project to provide the needed services to SEA's a survey form has been distributed to all Interstate Representatives. The replies will be of great assistance to the seven CAP states in making detailed plans for future services. A response from each state will be greatly appreciated and urgently needed.

Presentation by Arthur R. Olson, Director
Cooperative Accountability Project
at National Interstate Conference
Washington, D.C. May 2, 1974

APPENDIX A

National Interstate Conference
Title V, Section 505

May 1-2, 1974

Howard Johnsons Motor Lodge
Washington - National Airport
2650 Jefferson Davis Highway, Route 1
Arlington, Virginia
Morning Session - Conference Room 1

May 1, 1974

8:00 - 9:00 A.M. Registration

9:00 - 9:05 A.M. Orientation - Robb L. Shanks, Wisconsin

9:05 - 10:15 A.M. Chairman - Alpheus White, Director,
Division of State Assistance, U. S. Office of Education

9:05 A.M. Welcome to Washington
Thomas J. Burns - Acting Associate Commissioner,
Office of State and Local Educational Program, U.S.O.E.

9:30 A.M. Keynote Address
Topic: "Policy, Politics and Survival of the SEA's"
Harry Phillips - Commission on Educational
Governance and Structure, Maryland

Questions and Discussion - Mr. White, Moderator

10:15 - 10:45 A.M. Coffee Break

10:45 - 12:00 Noon Chairman - Roland Goddu, New Hampshire,
New England Project Director

10:45 A.M. Review of Regional Project Priorities.
Distribution of abstracts of project activities in the following regions:

1. New England
2. Upper Atlantic
3. Mid-Atlantic
4. Southeastern
5. Upper Midwest
6. Great Plains
7. Rocky Mountains
8. Pacific
9. Cooperative Accountability

Explanation of Project Displays

11:00 A.M. Report of National Survey of Chief State School Officers Priorities for Section 505.
Louis J. Michot - State Superintendent, Louisiana
Panel: Lyman Ginger - State Superintendent, Kentucky
Kenneth H. Hansen - State Superintendent, Nevada
Daniel B. Taylor - State Superintendent, West Virginia

12:00 - 1:15 P.M. Lunch for Conference Participants - Conference Rooms 2 & 3

1:15 - 4:00 P.M. Chairman - Robert Clemmer, Oregon
Pacific Project Director

1:15 P.M. Topics I through VI and Leaders (6 concurrent sessions)

I. Collective Bargaining -
Jon Peterson, Illinois, Office of Research

II. Competency Based Education - Ted Andrews,
New York, Director, Multi-State Consortium
William Grimsley, Secretary

III. Changing Federal - State - Local Relationship
A. Buchmiller, Wisconsin, Assistant State Superintendent
Max Morrison, Secretary

IV. Demand for Disclosure of Outcome Information -
Relation of SEA to Demand Groups - How to Involve Others in the Process of Accountability - B. G. Pauley,
West Virginia, Mid-Atlantic Project Director
L. K. Lovenstein, Secretary

V. State Administration of Multi-Purpose Grants -
Ernest Lehr, California, Special Assistant to the Education Program Administrator
Alex Law, Secretary

VI. Priorities of the Chief State School Officers for Title V, Section 505 - Betty Montero, Louisiana,
Southeastern Project Director

2:35 P.M. Repeat session of the six concurrent meetings listed at 1:15 P.M., so audience can participate in more than one topic.

4:00 P.M. Adjournment

4:00 P.M. Upper Atlantic Operational Planning Council Meeting

5:00 P.M. Social Hour

7:30 P.M. Mid-Atlantic Steering Committee Meeting

Morning Session - Conference Room 1

May 2, 1974 - Session Chairman - Max Morrison, Iowa,
Great Plains Project Director

9:00 A.M. Group Reports of views of participants from afternoon of May 1

I. Collective Bargaining - Jon Peterson, Illinois Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Research Division
II. Competency Based Education - William Grimsley, Colorado, Rocky Mountain Project Director
III. Changing Federal - State - Local Relationship - Archie Buchmiller, Wisconsin Assistant State Superintendent
IV. Demand for Disclosure of Outcome Information - Relationship of SEA to Demand Groups - How to Involve them in the Process of Accountability - B.G. Pauley, West Virginia, Mid-Atlantic Project Director
V. State Administration of Multi-Purpose Grants - Ernest Lehr, Special Assistant to the Education Program Administrator, California
VI. Chief State School Officers Priorities for Section 505 - Betty Montero, Louisiana, Southeastern Project Director

10:15 - 10:45 A.M. Coffee Break

10:45 A.M. Project Next Step: Planning in the S.E.A. - William Timmins, Utah, Project Director

11:00 A.M. Cooperative Accountability Project - Arthur Olson, Colorado, Project Director

11:15 A.M. Federal Legislation, FY 1975 and Section 505 - Al Alford, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Legislation, USOE

12:00 Noon Conference Summary - Bernard A. Kaplan, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Division of Research Planning and Evaluation, New Jersey

12:25 P.M. Adjournment

1:00 P.M. Upper Atlantic Operational Planning Council Meeting

APPENDIX B

REGIONAL INTERSTATE NATIONAL CONFERENCE
May 1-2, 1974

Al Alford, Assistant Commissioner
Office of Legislation, USOE
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Theodore Andrews
Director, Multi-State Consortium
99 Washington Ave.
Albany, NY 12210

New York State Department of Education

Diana J. Ashworth
Director, Office of Planning
S.C. Department of Education
Columbia, SC 29202

Buel N. Bowlan, Ph.D.
Education Program Director
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Arizona Department of Education

Fred Brown, Jr.
Associate State Superintendent
P.O. Box 8717, B.-W. Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

MD State Department of Education

Archie A. Buchmiller
Ass't State Superintendent
126 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53702

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

U.H. Budd
Coordinator of Federal Programs
120 East Tenth Street
Topeka, KS 66612

State Department of Education

Thomas J. Burns
Acting Assoc. Commissioner, USOE
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, DC 20202

Alex Canja
Ex. Assist. to State Superintendent
520 Michigan National Tower
Lansing, MI 48902

State Department of Education

Carlos Castano
Asst. to the Secretary of Education
Estocolmo St. #606
Caparra Heights, Puerto Rico 00922

Puerto Rico Dept. of Education

R.B. Clemmer
Coor. Planning & Program Evaluation
Dir. WRIPP
942 Lancaster Dr., N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Oregon State Dept. of Education

H.T. Conner
Assistant Superintendent
State Dept. Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC

State of North Carolina

Dr. Mildred P. Cooper
Asst. Supt. for Research & Evaluation
214 N. Irving St.
Arlington, VA 22201

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Jose Q. Cruz
Educational Planner
Government of Guam
Dept. of Education
Agana, Guam 96910

Guam Department of Education

Thomas J. Curtin
Deputy Commissioner of Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Massachusetts Dept. of Education

Herbert J. Edwards
Assistant Director, Bureau of
Planning and Evaluation
3 Homestead Lane
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Pennsylvania Dept. of Education

Fendall R. Ellis
Asst. Supt. for Program Development
Ninth Street State Office Bldg.
State Dept. of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Virginia State Dept. of Education

Jerry Engeleiter
Legislative Assistant to
Congressman Steiger
1025 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20515

House of Representatives

Paul R. Fillion
Chief, Division of Administration
State Dept. of Education
Concord, NH 03301

New England Region Interstate Project-505

Katherine P. Finley
Deputy Associate Superintendent
615 Boyd Ave., Apt. 4
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Louisiana State Dept. of Education

Marshall L. Frinks
Associate for Planning & Coordination
125 Miles Johnson Bldg.
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

State of Florida, Dept. of Education

Dr. Harry M. Gardner
Col/Univ Unit, Office of Deputy
Commissioner of Post Secondary
Education/USOE
ROB #3, Rm. 4683, 7th & D St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

USOE Post Secondary Education
Deputy Commissioner's Office

Dr. Harriet L. Gesler
Chief, Office of Departmental Planning
Conn. State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT

Conn. State Dept. of Education

James E. Gibbs
Chief, Multi State Projects Branch DSA
USOE
907 Darton Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308

U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Lyman Ginger
State Superintendent
State Dept. of Education
Frankfort, KY 40601

State Dept. of Education

Roland Goddu
Director, NEPTE
PetteeBrook Offices
Durham, NH 03824

New England Interstate 505

William G. Grimsley
Director, RIPP
201 E. Colfax
Denver, CO 80203

Colorado Dept. of Education

Kenneth H. Hansen
Supt. of Public Instruction
Nevada Dept. of Education
Carson City, NV 89701

Nevada Dept. of Education

Byron Hansford
Executive Secretary
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Council of Chief State School Officers

Gus W. Harrell
Deputy Superintendent
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona State Dept. of Education

Sam P. Harris
Education Program Specialist
Div. of State Assistance-USOE
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Room 3104A (ROB-3)
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Ralph G. Hay
421 Graham
Helena, MT 59601

Montana Supt. of Public Instruction

Walter R. Howard, Director
Div. Program Planning & Needs Assess.
6811 De Paul Cove
Austin, TX 78723

Texas Education Agency

D'Alan E. Huff
Chief, State Program Branch
12508 Chalford Lane
Bowie, MD 20715

U.S. Office of Education

Thomas L. Johns
Program Officer
Washington, D.C.

USOE

Bernard A. Kaplan
Deputy Asst. Commissioner
225 W. State Street
Trenton, NJ 08625

New Jersey Dept. of Education

Miriam A. Kazanjian
Federal Relations Representative
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

New York State Education Dept.

Norman D. Kurland
Assistant Commissioner
110 Salisbury Rd
Delmar, NY 12054

New York State Education Dept.

Ralph H. Lataille
Chief of Personnel
199 Promenade Road
Providence, RI 02908

Rhode Island State Dept. of Education

Alexander I. Law
Chief, Office Evaluation & Research
California State Dept. of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

State of California

Lamar Le Fevre
Asst. Superintendent
S. Nevada, Dept. of Education
805 Antiqua
Las Vegas, NV 89124

Nevada State Dept. of Education

Ernest Lehr, Special Assistant to
the Education Program Administrator
California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

L.K. Lovenstein
Coordinator, Mid-Atlantic Int. Proj.
Capitol Complex Bldg. 6-Rm. B363
Charleston, WV 25305

West Virginia Dept. of Education

Ronald Luckie
Director, Div. of PRE, Georgia SEA
4726 Fountainhead Dr.
Stone Mt., GA 30083

Georgia Dept. of Education

J. Douglas Machesney
Asst. Supt.-West Virginia
719 Churchill Drive
Charleston, WV 25314

Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project

P. Alistair MacKinnon
Asst. to Commissioner
NY State Education Department
Albany, NY 12224

New York State Education Dept.

Dexter A. Magers
Education Program Specialist
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Joe Mara
Director, Planning & Evaluation
1920 Washington
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Nebraska State Dept. of Education

Clarence Masumotoya
Director of Federal Programs
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Department of Education of Hawaii

Eva J. Mertena
Federal Programs Analyst
Old Capitol Bldg.
Olympia, Washington 98501

Supt. of Public Instruction

Louis J. Michot
State Superintendent
Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Louisiana State Dept. of Education

Charles H. Miller
Education Program Officer
Bilingual Education-USOE
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Betty B. Montero
Director, Southeastern Project
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Louisiana State Dept. of Education

Ada I. Morales
Director, Educational Dev. Program
Dept. of Education
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919

Alternate Rep.-Interstate Project

Max Morrison
Director, Planning, Research
and Evaluation
Grimes Office Bldg.
Dept. of Public Instruction
Des Moines, IA 50125

Joseph H. Oakey
Deputy Director of Education
Headquarters Dept. of Education
Saipan, MI 96950

Trust Territory of Pacific Islands

Arthur R. Olson
Director, CAP
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, CO 80203

Cooperative Accountability Project

LeRoy Ortgiesen
Deputy Commissioner of Education
1715 South 47th St.
Lincoln, NE 68506

Nebraska State Dept. of Education

Berthold G. Pauley
Asst. State Superintendent
1029 Timberview Drive
Charleston, WV 25314

West Virginia Board of Education

Norris M. Paulson
Asst. Supt. of Federal Programs
Dept. of Public Instruction
Pierre, S.D. 57501

Elementary and Secondary Education

Dr. Jon Peterson
Office of Supt. of Public Instruction
216 E. Monroe
Springfield, IL 62706

Sherman Peterson
Asst. Director, Planning & Evaluation
Dept. of Education, Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AK 72201

Southeastern Interstate, Dept. of Education

David G. Phillips
Program Advisor
USOE--400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

USOE

Harry Phillips
Commission on Educational Governance
and Structure
State Office Building
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Dr. Don K. Richards
Administrative Asst. & Planning
1610 University Club Bldg.
136 E. South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Utah State Board of Education

Dr. J.M. Roberts
Director, Interagency Relations
Cordell Hull Bldg.
Nashville, Tenn. 37214

Tennessee Dept. of Education

Gerard Robinson
Planning Specialist
Pinecrest Circle
Williston, VT 05495

Vermont Dept. of Education

Howard E. Row
Asst. State Supt. of Public Instruction
Townsend Bldg.
Dover, DE 19901

Dept. of Public Instruction

Earl P. Schubert
Asst. Regional Commissioner of Education
1114 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75200

Region VI (Dallas) Office of Education

Harry L. Selden
Program Manager/D.S.A.
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

USOE

David W. Shannon
Head, Office of Planning & Research
Dept. of Education
Mall Apts., 207A
Bowling Green, KY 42101

Kentucky Dept. of Education

Robb L. Shanks
Interstate Project Director
National Coordinator
126 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53702

Ray Slaby
Assoc. Supt., State of Indiana
State House, Room 227
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dept. of Public Instruction

Emmett J. Slingsby
Asst. State Supt. of Public Instruction
Federal Gov. Relations
302 New State Office Bldg.
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Public Instruction-State of Illinois

Charles G. Smith, Jr.
Program Specialist
2832 Hunter Mill Road
Oakton, VA 22124

USOE

Mrs. Ethel H. Spates
Secretary to Dr. A.L. White
OE-400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Paul E. Spayde
Asst. Superintendent
3924 Norbrook Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Ohio Dept. of Education

James P. Steffensen, Chief of
Program Dev. Branch
Room 2089, Teacher Corps
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Tom Stefonek
Chief, Section for Educational Planning
126 Langdon
Madison, WI 53702

Dept. of Public Instruction

Edwin E. Steinbrecher
Asst. Commissioner
Colorado Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg.
Sherman & Colfax
Denver, CO 80201

Colorado Dept. of Education

Dan B. Taylor
State Superintendent
State Capitol
Charleston, WV 25314

State Board of Education

Dr. William M. Timmins
Director, Interstate Projects
1400 University Club Bldg.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Utah Board of Education

Rita E. Underwood
Research Assistant
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
ROB, Room 3012
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Frank Vittetow
Asst. Supt. of Public Instruction
Department of Education
Plaza Towers
Frankfort, KY 40601

Gregory J. Waddick, Asst. Comm.
5532 W. 104th St.
Bloomington, MN 55437

Minnesota Department of Education

Ivan D. Wagner
Director of Planning & Evaluation
State House, Room 125
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204

Indiana Dept. of Public Instruction

Edmund H. Weiss
Director, Bureau of Planning
N.J. Dept. of Education
225 W. State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Department of Education

Dr. A.L. White
Director, Div. of State Assistance
400 Maryland Ave., ROB #3
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. Office of Education

Don White
Deputy Supt. for Congressional Rec.
California Dept. of Education
417 New Jersey Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

California Dept. of Education

Clark D. Williams
Education Consultant
Room 406, State Office Bldg.
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Alabama State Dept. of Education